
Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 04/11] kmem accounting basic infrastructure
Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Wed, 15 Aug 2012 13:04:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 08/15/2012 05:02 PM, Michal Hocko wrote:

> On Wed 15-08-12 16:53:40, Glauber Costa wrote:

> [...]

>>>>> This doesn't check for the hierarchy so kmem_accounted might not be in
>>>>> sync with its parents. mem_cgroup_create (below) needs to copy
>>>>> kmem_accounted down from the parent and the above needs to check if this
>>>>> is a similar dance like mem_cgroup_oom_control_write.

>>>>>

>>>>

>>>> I don't see why we have to.

>>>>

>>>> I believe in a A/B/C hierarchy, C should be perfectly able to set a
>>>> different limit than its parents. Note that this is not a boolean.

>>>

>>> Ohh, I wasn't clear enough. I am not against setting the _limit_ I just
>>> meant that the kmem_accounted should be consistent within the hierarchy.

>>>

>>

>> If a parent of yours is accounted, you get accounted as well. This is
>> not the state in this patch, but gets added later. Isn't this enough ?

>

> But if the parent is not accounted, you can set the children to be
> accounted, right? Or maybe this is changed later in the series? I didn't
> get to the end yet.

>

Yes, you can. Do you see any problem with that?
